

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed September 12, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 remain in this application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 5 and 7-8 are allowed and that claims 2-3 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that claims 5 and 7-8 are allowed and that claims 2-3 and 6 contain allowable subject matter. By means of the present amendment, claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form.

Accordingly, allowance of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,777,404 (Kiesel) in view of GB 688859 (Charles). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 4 are patentable over Kiesel and Charles for at least the following reasons.

As correctly noted by the Examiner of page 3 of the Office Action, Kiesel does not teach or suggest means for protection against oxidation are chosen from the group of materials formed by chromium-manganese, chromium-cobalt and chromium-boron alloys. Charles is cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in Kiesel.

Charles discloses a lamp having glass-to metal seals including an alloy containing chromium, iron, nickel, cobalt and manganese. It is respectfully submitted that Kiesel, Charles, and combination thereof, do not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 1 which, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein the means for protection against oxidation includes chromium-boron alloy.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 should also be allowed at least based on its dependence from independent claim 1 as well as its individually patentable elements.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By Dicran Halajian
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
December 10, 2007

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101